Attachment 8 - OJP-2001-R-002

| CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE REPORT | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| [] Final [] Interim Period Report: From: | To | | | | |
| 1. Contractor Name and Address: | | | | | |
| 2. Contract Number: | 3. Contract Value: (base + options) | | | | |
| 4. a) Contract Award Date: | b) Contract Completion Date: | | | | |
| 5. Type of Contract: (Check all that apply) []FP []FPI []FP - EPA []Award Fee []CPFF - Completion []CPFF - Term []CPIF []CPAF []ID/IQ []BOA []Requirements []Labor Hour [] T&M []SBSA 8 (a) []SBIR []Sealed Bid []Negotiated []Competitive []Non-Competitive | | | | | |
| 6. Description of Requirement: | | | | | |
| | e and indicate the number which corresponds to . Please see page three for explanation of rating | | | | |
| Quality - Comments: Rating - 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 [] | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Cost Control - Comments: Rating - 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 [] Timeliness of Performance - Comments: Rating - 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 **Business Relations - Comments:** Rating - 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 [] Meeting Small and SDB Subcontracting Goals - Comments: Rating - 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 Mean Score (Add the ratings above and divide by the number of areas rated.)

| 8. A | . Are subcontracts involved? Yes / No | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| P | Please comment on those subcontractors that have provided significant contributions. | | | | | |
| 9.] | Key Personnel | | | | | |
| | <u> </u> | Employment Date | | | | |
| (| Comments/Rating [] Name | Employment Date | | | | |
| (| Comments/Rating [] | Employment Date | | | | |
| (| Comments/Rating [] | | | | | |
| | 10. Is this contractor committed to customer service? Yes / No Would you select this firm again? Yes / No Please explain. | | | | | |
| 11. 1 | Program Officer Name: | Signature: | | | | |
|] | Phone/Fax/Internet Address: | Date: | | | | |
| | 2. Contractor's Review. Were comments, rebuttals, or additional information provided? [] No [] Yes. Please attach comments. | | | | | |
| | Contractor Name: Phone/Fax/Internet Address | Signature: Date: | | | | |
| | 4. Agency Review: Were contractor comments reviewed at a level above the contracting officer? [] No [] Yes - Please attach comments. Number of pages: | | | | | |
| 15. Final Ratings: Re-assess the Block 7 ratings based on contractor comments and agency review. Revise block 7 ratings, if appropriate. | | | | | | |
| Quali | ty Cost Control Timeliness F | Business Relations Meeting S/SBD goals | | | | |
| Mear | Mean Score (Add the ratings above and divide by the number of areas rated) | | | | | |
| | Contracting Officer Name: Phone/Fax/Internet Address | Signature: Date: | | | | |

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE REPORT INSTRUCTIONS

- **Block 1:** Contractor Name and Address. Identify the specific division being evaluated if there is more than one.
- **Block 2:** Contract number of contract being evaluated.
- **Block 3:** Contract value shall include base plus options. If funding was increased or decreased during the evaluation period, the value in block should reflect the change.
- **Block 4:** Contract award date and anticipated or anticipated contract completion date.
- **Block 5:** Type of Contact: Check all that apply.
- **Block 6:** Provide a brief description of the work being done under the contract and identify the key performance indicators. This description will allow agencies calling for references checks to compare statements of work.
- **Block 7:** Indicate the rating below each column and provide brief narrative for each of the categories rated. Indicate the contract requirements that were exceeded or were not met by the contractor and by how much. Also calculate the mean score and the ratings.
- **Block 8:** Comment on Significant subcontractors, if any.
- **Block 9:** List the names and employment dates of the contractor's key personnel. This will provide a record of how long these managers worked on the contract. If there were many changes in these managers a second page may be necessary. On the comment/rating line briefly describe the managers performance.
- **Block 10:** If given a choice, please explain why you would or why you would not select the contractor for this contract again.
- **Block 11:** The program office person most familiar with the contractor's performance should sign this block. The rating is a combined program office, contracting officer decision. The contacting officer's signature in block signifies concurrence with this rating and the final rating, if a revised rating is necessary.
- **Block 12-13:** The contractor may provide comments but must sign block 12 to indicate review of the rating.
- **Block 14:** If the contractor and contracting officer are unable to agree on a final rating, an agency review at a level above the contracting officer is required.
- **Block 15:** Adjust the ratings assigned in block 7, if appropriate, based on any comments, rebuttals, or additional information provided by the contractor and, if necessary, by the agency review. Calculate a mean score of the contractor's performance.
- **Block 16:** The contracting officer's signature certifies concurrence with the initial and final ratings.

RATING GUIDELINES

Summarize contractor performance in each of the rating areas. Assign each area a rating of 0 (Unsatisfactory), 1 (Poor), 2 (Fair), 3 (Good), 4 (Excellent), or 5 (Outstanding). Use the following instructions as guidance in making these evaluations. Ensure that this assessment is consistent with any other Agency assessment made (i.e., for payment of fee purposes).

| , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | | , 11, | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| Quality of Product/Service | Cost Control | Timeliness of Performance | Business <u>Relations</u> | Implementing Small and SDB Program |
| -Compliance with contract requirements -Accuracy of reports -Appropriateness of personnel -Technical excellence | -Within budget (over/under target costs) -Current, accurate, and complete billings -Relationship of negotiated cost to actual -Cost efficiencies -Change orders issue | -Met interim milestone -Reliable -Responsive to technic direction -Completed on time, including wrap-up an contract administrat -No liquidated damag assessed | -Business correspondence al -Responsive to contract requirements -Prompt notification of d problems ion -Reasonable/cooperative | subcontracting program |
| Nonconformances are compromising the achievement of contract requirements, despite use of Agency resource. | Cost issues are compromising performance of contract requirements. | Delays are compromising the achievement of contract requirements despite use of Agency resources. | Response to inquires, technical/service/ administrative issues is not effective and responsive. | Small & SDB participation was unacceptable and future small and SDB participation unlikely |
| 1. Poor: Nonconformances require major Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirement. Remedial attention | Cost issues require major Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements. | Delays require major Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements. | Response to inquiries, technical/service/ administrative issues is marginally effective and responsive. | Small & SDB participation was significantly less than projected. |
| | | | · | , as necessary |
| 2. Fair: Nonconformances require minor Agency resources to ensure achievement of requirements | Cost issues require minor Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements. | Delays require minor Agency resources to ensure achievement of is somewhat effective contract requirements. | Response to inquiries, technical/service/ administrative issue is marginally effective and responsive. | Small & SDB participation was somewhat achieved. Reporting requirements required more than minor corrective action |
| 3. Good: Nonconformances do not impact achievement of contract requirements. | Cost issues do not impact achievement of contract requirements. | Delays do not impact achievement of contract requirements. | Response to inquiries, technical/service/ administrative issues is usually effective and responsive. | Small & SDB participation was fully in line with projected goals. Reports required only minor corrective action. |
| 4. Excellent: There are no quality problems. was | There are no cost issues. | There are no delays. | Response to inquiries, technical/service/ | Small & SDB participation |
| | | | dministrative issues s effective and responsive. | substantially above projected goals. |

Reports required no corrective action.

5. Outstanding:

The contractor has demonstrated an exceptional performance level in any of the above four categories that justifies adding a point to the score. It is expected that this rating will be used in those rare circumstance when contractor performance clearly exceeds the performance levels described as "Excellent."